## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

James Gatewood Blakely,	)	C/A No. 5:12-cv-410-MBS-KDW
a/k/a James G. Blakely,	)	
a/k/a Jimmy G. Blakely;	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	Report and Recommendation
V.	)	
	)	
Michael McCall, D Bush, S Clayton, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se and *in forma pauperis*, brought this action alleging violations of his constitutional rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Defendant Enloe filed a Motion for Summary Judgment on September 26, 2012. ECF No. 28. As Plaintiff is proceeding pro se, the court entered an order on September 27, 2012, pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), advising Plaintiff of the importance of a motion for summary judgment and of the need for him to file an adequate response. ECF No. 29. Plaintiff was specifically advised that if he failed to respond adequately, that Defendant Enloe's motion may be granted, thereby potentially ending this case. Notwithstanding the specific warning and instructions set forth in the court's *Roseboro* order, Plaintiff has failed to respond to the motion.

On November 7, 2012, the court ordered Plaintiff to advise whether he wished to continue with the case by November 26, 2012. ECF No. 33. Plaintiff has filed no response. As such, it appears to the court that Plaintiff does not oppose Defendant Enloe's motion and wishes to abandon his action. Based on the foregoing, the undersigned recommends that the action

against Defendant Enloe be dismissed with prejudice for failure to prosecute. *See Davis v. Williams*, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

IT IS SO RECOMMENDED.

November 28, 2012 Florence, South Carolina Kaymani D. West United States Magistrate Judge

Haymai D.)

The parties are directed to note the important information in the attached "Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation."